REMARKS

This amendment is submitted in response to the outstanding Office Action, dated November 21, 2000. Claims 1 through 28 are presently pending in the above-identified patent application. Claims 1, 8, 15, 16, 22 and 28 have been amended. No additional fee is due.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1 through 28 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Ingrassia (United States Patent No. 5,941,957).

The present invention provides a web browser and a web server that accommodate a time stamp parameter and allows a user to refer to a Web address with a precise target time. The persistent Web server (i) receives URLs containing a time stamp, (ii) retrieves the correct version of the Web page from an archive, and (iii) returns the requested page to the client. The persistent Web server interprets the extracted URL in accordance with the selected time stamp format. In addition, the persistent Web servers include a persistent archive for storing all of the versions of Web resources that will be persistently available to Web users. In addition, a persistent domain name server (PDNS) allows a user to refer to historical Web resources, for example, following a corporate merger or domain name change. The persistent domain name server (PDNS) utilizes the dated URL to determine where the historical information of a company is located for the requested time period and translates the request to a new machine containing the historical information of the company.

The Examiner rejected Claims 1 through 28 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Ingrassia (United States Patent No. 5,941,957). The Examiner asserts that Ingrassia discloses a method of providing an electronic document having at least one version identified by a time-stamp. The Examiner asserts that Column 7, lines 30-65, of Ingrassia discloses that the request for an electronic document includes a time-stamp.

First, it is noted that Ingrassia is directed to a method for propagating data through a distributed network to a number of browsers in a synchronized manner. The time-stamps in Ingrassia are utilized to identify when a given electronic document is loaded or unloaded by a given browser. See, Col. 7, line 59; Col. 8, lines 16 and 42. See also, Col. 19, line 61. Thus, the same version of a document has multiple time-stamps,

each corresponding to a load time or unload time by a given browser. Generally, the load/unload time stamps are used to synchronize a session of many web browsers to follow a lead browser. Thus, while the time-stamps in Ingrassia correspond to access times of the electronic documents, the time-stamps of the present invention correspond to the creation time of a particular version of the electronic document. Furthermore, the time-stamps in Ingrassia are issued by the central WTS server 144, and are not received by the server with a request for the resource from a client with the time-stamp identifying a particular version.

Thus, Ingrassia does not disclose or suggest a time-stamp in a URL to identify a particular version of a multiple-version document, as required by each of the independent claims of the present invention, as amended. In addition, Ingrassia does not disclose or suggest identifying a machine storing a version of said electronic document for a time period corresponding to said time-stamp as a function of the time-stamp, as further required by each of the independent claims of the present invention, as amended.

Dependent Claims 2-7, 9-14, 17-21 and 23-27 were also rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Ingrassia. Claims 2-7, 9-14, 17-21 and 23-27 are dependent on Claims 1, 8, 15, 16, 22 or 28 and are therefore patentably distinguished over Ingrassia because of their dependency from amended independent Claims 1, 8, 15, 16, 22 or 28, for the reasons set forth above, as well as other elements these claims add in combination to their base claim.

In view of the foregoing, the invention, as claimed in Claims 1 through 28, cannot be said to be either taught or suggested by Ingrassia. Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 1 through 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) be withdrawn.

All of the pending claims, i.e., claims 1 through 28, are in condition for allowance and such favorable action is earnestly solicited.

If any outstanding issues remain, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions for expediting allowance of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

The Examiner's attention to this matter is appreciated.

Respectfully submitted,

RYAN, MASON & LEWIS, LLP

Dated: February 16, 2001

By: _Kevin M. Mason_
Kevin M. Mason
Reg. No. 36,597

Mailing Address:
Ryan, Mason & Lewis, LLP
1300 Post Road, Suite 205
Fairfield, CT 06430
TEL: (203) 255-6560
FAX: (203) 255-6570